



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE STATUE OF ATHENA PARTHENOS

RECENTLY FOUND AT ATHENS.



Fig. 1. — ATHENA.

BAS-RELIEF IN THE MUSEUM AT BERLIN.

REPRODUCED FROM THE "GAZETTE DES BEAUX-ARTS."

shapeless, the toes of the feet separated by parallel incisions, as in the wooden dolls sold in the open-air stalls on New Year's day; the sphinx which supports the crest, and the griffins which flank it right and left, are altogether grotesque. A meritorious attempt has been made to give the grace of the features and the smile of the mouth; but, alas! it has miscarried completely. Mr. Newton has, it seems to me, done too much honor to this marble by attributing it to the time of Hadrian.³ I believe it to be sixty or eighty years later; that is to say, I would place its execution in the last years of the second century, or even in the beginning of the third. We have works of much more skilful execution even of the time of Gordian. Nor is it possible, as in the case of the statuette found in the temple of Theseus by Charles Lenormant (Fig. 3), and published in this journal by his son, to attribute the grossness of the work to the negligence or the hurry of the artist. That is a work "which shows that a very wise man has applied himself to it."

From the point of view of archæology, on the contrary, our statue is of sufficiently great interest. It does not, indeed, supply us with unexpected revelations, or with information of capital importance concerning the work of which it pretends — somewhat presumptuously — to be a copy. But it converts into assured facts certain hypotheses which until now were only probable, and solves questions upon which sceptical people might have continued to split hairs. It confirms, almost from one end to the other, the ideas of M. François Lenormant; justifies the importance attached by him to the unfinished statue of the Theseion, and proves the entire exactness of the

¹ François Lenormant, *La Minerve du Parthénon*, in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, Vol. VIII. pp. 129, 202, and 278.

² I embrace the occasion to call attention to this excellent repertory, which reflects the greatest honor upon our school at Athens. Although principally devoted to epigraphy, it nevertheless does not neglect the arts, and publishes excellent reproductions of marbles, terra-cottas, and bronzes found in Greece. [See a quotation from the article in question, concerning the traces of color found on the statue, in the paragraph on *The Statuette of Athena Parthenos*, p. 257, first division of this volume of the REVIEW.]

³ See *Academy*, Feb. 12th, 1881, p. 124. [Quoted in the REVIEW, first division of this volume, p. 257.]

IN the year 1860 the *Gazette* published a long and very interesting essay, by M. François Lenormant, on the ideal reconstruction of the Athena Parthenos.¹ We are pleased to be now enabled to lay before our readers the new repetition of the work of Pheidias, which was found not long ago at Athens, near the Varvakeion, that is to say, in the northwestern part of the old city, not far from the Acharnian gate. The photographs, of which summary reproductions are given herewith (Fig. 2), came to us at the last moment, so that we can add only a few brief reflections, jotted down on the spur of the moment. Those desirous of being informed more in detail concerning the finding of the statue, and the minor points which it presents, and especially in regard to the traces of painting still to be seen in many places, can find what they want in an article published in the January number of the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*,² by M. Hauvette-Besnault, one of the young members of our school at Athens.

If, for the purpose of estimating the value of the new statue, we look at it from an artistic point of view, we shall no doubt find that it hardly deserves the noise made about it, somewhat rashly, by the Mayor of Athens. It is a clumsily executed piece of work, in which even the proportions of the original are undoubtedly missed, and in which the details are given as awkwardly as possible. The hands are

text of Pausanias, from which Simart departed wrongfully in several points. Thus, for example, it shows that the serpent Erichthonios was really at the left of the goddess, in the cavity of the shield; that the helmet was surmounted by only one sphinx, flanked by griffins; and that it did not have upon the visor the heavy and baroque garniture of galloping horses, which had been borrowed from tetradrachmas of the Macedonian period and from the intaglio of Aspasio.

The statue of the Varvakeion, therefore, gives us the *ensemble* of the work of Pheidias more completely than we have heretofore had it. This is its great but only merit, since, for every detail separately considered, we possess already a more instructive document. For the helmet we must go to a small head in bronze which, three or four years ago, was offered to the Louvre by a Greek travelling merchant, and which, if I am not mistaken, was bought by the British Museum.¹ One of the griffins placed alongside of the crest is

still perfectly preserved in this head, and is superb in its movement. For the position of the body, the movement of the legs, the form of the ægis, and the arrangement of the double tunic, we can wish for nothing better than the magnificent fragment found in 1859 not far from the Propyleia. This work, published by Michaelis,² is almost contemporaneous with the Parthenos, and in its drawing preserves tolerably well the majesty of the lines of the model, but does not reproduce its grandeur and suppleness. For the basis, the statuette of the Theseion is still the only document which completes the texts of Pliny and Pausanias. As to the battle of the Athenian heroes with the Amazons, carved upon the shield, we are even yet restricted to the mediocre and uncertain indications of the same statue, and of the Strangford shield. The coins (Figs. 4 and 5), finally, give us only the lance which the goddess held against the rim of the shield with the thumb of her left hand; they also indicate with the greatest exactitude the position of the Victory, showing her completely turned towards Athena. The three-quarter position adopted by the sculptor in the Varvakeion statue is neither logically admissible nor is it satisfactory to the eye.

By way of compensation for the problems which it solves, the statue of the Varvakeion raises another. The Victory in gold and ivory, which the Parthenos held upon her extended right hand, measured six feet in height; it was therefore a statue of natural size. Even if we suppose that the wooden kernel placed inside was as light as possible; that the gold of the vestments was hammered, which would allow of great thinness; and that, finally, the ivory inlays were of the slightest, the weight of this Victory must nevertheless have been considerable. Would a metal bar, placed horizontally in the right arm of the Parthenos, have been sufficient to sustain it? Or was a vertical support thought indispensable, however inelegant it might have been? If this support existed only in the statue of the Varvakeion, we might attribute its addition to the timidity of the sculptor, and to the necessities of the material he employed. But it is also represented on an Athenian bas-relief (Fig. 1) of the period of independence. No motive of stability can here be made a pretext: if the author of this bas-relief has figured a small column under the hand of Athena, it must be because he had seen it in the Parthenon. However, since



Fig. 2. — ATHENA PARTHENOS

FOUND AT ATHENS, NEAR THE VARVAKEION.

REPRODUCED FROM THE "GAZETTE DES BEAUX-ARTS."

¹ This head is still unpublished.

² *Der Parthenon*, Pl. XV. No. 2.



Fig. 3.—THE ATHENA OF THE THESEION.

REPRODUCED FROM THE "GAZETTE DES BEAUX-ARTS."

of medium size, and simply of bronze, is more praised than the Parthenos. No man can forever sustain himself at the same height, and it is quite possible that Pheidias was inferior to himself precisely in those works for which he had at his disposal the greatest material resources, and of which we moderns speak most frequently.

O. RAYET. (In *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*.)

¹ They are all collected in Michaelis, *Der Parthenon*, pp. 266-284; Overbeck, *Antike Schriftquellen*, Nos. 645-690; and in Otto Jahn and Michaelis, *Pausania Descriptio Arcis Athenarum*, 2d ed., pp. 14-18.



Fig. 4.—TETRADRACHMA OF ANTIOCHOS VII.



Fig. 5.—COIN OF SARDIS.

when was it there? Had Pheidias himself placed it there, or had it, perhaps, been added upon the occasion of some restoration of his work? We know, indeed, that the Parthenos very soon began to crack. The generation which saw it put in place also saw its first complete restoration, and by how many other partial repairs must this restoration have been followed?

Our admiration for the great master instinctively inclines us to prefer the second supposition to the first. The idea that he might have been compelled to resort to such a clumsy artifice repels and shocks us. But however this may be, our repugnance is not an argument, and, in spite of ourselves, the question remains posed. Moreover, we must not forget that, in the numerous passages in ancient authors which refer to the Athena Parthenos,¹ its size and its richness are incessantly praised; but nowhere do we find signs of a sincere and profoundly felt admiration, like that which the Olympian Zeus called forth from all the world. Even the Lemnian Athena, although